



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/600,057

10/05/2000

Edwin W. Ades

6395-81114-12

7894

46135 7590 07/01/2009  
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP  
121 S.W. SALMON STREET  
SUITE 1600  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

SWARTZ, RODNEY P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1645

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/600,057	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1645	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D., Primary Examiner. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Jodi L. Connolly, Ph.D., Reg. No. 54,044. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
           c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
       If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 22-24.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner further explained that the rejection was based on the indefiniteness of whether the claimed fragments are also lipidated or not. Discussed claim language amendments. Changes to recite "or an immunogenic lipidated fragment thereof appears to be acceptable..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645	
--	--